

REMARKS

In response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed October 29, 2010, Applicants submit this Reply. Claims 20 and 21 are amended, and new claim 22 is added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The limitations corresponding to the specific limitations identified by the examiner as failing to comply with the written description requirement have been amended and a new limitation added, which we now discuss in turn.

The claim recites “retrieving the compressed digital video information to provide corresponding video fields at a frame rate of 24 frames per second....” Support for this limitation may be found at least in Figure 1, and in the specification at page 15, line 28 to page 16 line 2, which states: “Referring again to FIG. 1, in creating an NTSC video from a digitized film version, the video compessor 30 retrieves the digitized video frames from the computer 18 and based on the electronic bin information, designates video fields.”

In the next limitation, the claim recites “processing the video fields to introduce redundant images according to the received information....” Support may be found at least in Figures 1 and 2, and in the specification at page 16, lines 2-5, which states: “The video A/D 26 then creates an analog version of the video frames and processes the frames using a pulldown scheme like that illustrated in FIG. 2 to introduce redundant video frames.”

The final limitation of the claim recites “controlling a speed of playback of the processed video fields to provide a video signal having a frame rate of 29.97.” This limitation is supported at least by Figures 1 and 2, and the specification at page 16, lines 5-6, which states: “The video speed is then controlled by the timing circuit 28 to produce 29.97 fps video as required for an NTSC videotape.”

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants believe claim 20 satisfies the written description requirement of Section 112.

Claim 21 includes analogous limitations to claim 20. The various structures corresponding to the limitations may be found at least in Figure 1, and in the specification at page 4, line 28 to page 5, line 18.

New Claim

New claim 22 recites a computer-based system, for which there is support in Figure 1 (reference nos. 18 and 32), and in the specification at least at page 4 line 28 to page 5 line 18.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the outstanding rejections should be withdrawn, and the patent application allowed to issue.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including any extension fee or fee for claims, please charge any fee to **Deposit Account No. 50-0876**.

Filed via EFS-Web
on Janaury 20, 2011

Respectfully submitted,
/Oliver Strimpel/

Oliver Strimpel
Registration No. 56,451
Attorney for Applicants
Avid Technology, Inc.
75 Network Drive
Burlington, MA 01803
Tel.: (978) 640-6789